



P-ISSN 2355-2794  
E-ISSN 2461-0275

## The Application of Swales' Model in Writing a Research Article Introduction

Burhanuddin Yasin<sup>\*1</sup>  
Hijjatul Qamariah<sup>2,3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Syiah Kuala University, Banda Aceh, INDONESIA

<sup>2</sup>Iskandarmuda University, Banda Aceh, INDONESIA

<sup>3</sup>Islamic State University (UIN) Ar-Raniry, Banda Aceh, INDONESIA

### Abstract

*This research attempts to suggest an alternative solution for writers in general and graduate students in particular in writing a proper research article introduction. In order to do so, the authors explored how the Swales' model is applied in writing a research article introduction. This was approached through a library study on the Swales model application. Some previous studies applying Swales Model were gathered and categorized into three categories – application of Swales model on different types of genre besides the research article introduction, different discipline or field and the last is the application of Swales' on the research article introduction across languages. Another three articles written by professional writers were also collected as samples of introductions that have successfully presented three obligatory moves – establishing a territory (Move 1), establishing a niche (Move 2) and occupying the niche or presenting the present work (Move 3) – proposed by Swales' model. Those introductions were segmented into those three moves and analyzed based on a communication purpose in every step derived from each move. In order to add more comprehension about the model, an analysis was also conducted on introductions for seven articles in the English Education Journal (EEJ) published by the Graduate Program in English Language Education at Syiah Kuala University. The purpose of the analysis was to show the differences in structure of introductions organized without following the CARS Swales model. Conclusions are that the CARS Swales model is relevant for the teaching of introductions for research writing and it can be a guideline to teach students the moves and steps of this model for communication purposes.*

**Keywords:** Swales' model, Create a Research Space (CARS), writing, research article introduction.

---

\*Corresponding author, email: [burhanyasin@yahoo.com](mailto:burhanyasin@yahoo.com)

## 1. INTRODUCTION

A research article is one of the genres of academic writing that is believed to be a great medium for spreading and disseminating knowledge in the academic world (Peacock, 2002). The need for information and knowledge from other experts from outside of one's local area, particularly from English as a Foreign Language (EFL) and English as a Second Language (ESL) countries has made research articles an important genre amongst EFL and ESL scholars and researchers. The great number of research articles already published then become a resource for many writers, particularly for non-native speakers of English to refer to in writing a good research article in order to convince readers, editors as well as reviewers that the research article proposed deserves to be published (Flowerdew, 1999).

The importance of research article development in academic communities has stimulated many scientists to conduct research on it, including the organization structure of research articles; ranging from the structure of abstracts (Golebiowski, 2008; Samraj, 2005), results (Bret (1994) and William (1999), as cited in Ozturk, 2007), discussions (Holmes, 1997, as cited in Jalilifar, 2010) and conclusions (Ruiying & Allison, 2003). As part of the interest of studies conducted on all sections of research articles, the introduction section has received special attention particularly following the introduction of the Swales' model (1990) pioneered the Create a Research Space (CARS) model.

Writing a research article introduction is demanding. Safnil (2007) states that the introduction for a research article represents the connection between the readers and the authors' work, if it can bridge the gap between the knowledge of the intended readers and the research paper then it will show that the introduction is successful. Hunston (1994) as cited in Safnil (2007) also claims that the introduction section communicates the sub-persuasive purpose of the research article which shows that the research article is necessary and worthwhile, thus, if readers find that the introduction to the article is convincing, interesting and necessary they will be more likely to read the whole article. Gupta (as cited in Safnil, 2007) asserts that writing an introduction for a scientific text raises problems for not only novice authors or students but also for professional or experienced authors. Additionally, Flowerdew (1999, p. 127) states, "the introduction is challenging because it requires a persuasive style of writing in which the individual voice of the author(s) needs to come through".

On the basis of the importance, position and function of a research article introduction, a standard schema is needed in order to write one successfully. Otherwise, the writers intended purpose may not be successfully conveyed to the readers and may fail to convince them and also reviewers as well as the editor that the article proposed deserves to be published. This researcher therefore, believes that the CARS or Swales' model is a good schema to use in writing a research article introduction. Based on the above research problem, the author formulated the following research question: *How does the Swales' model apply for writing the introduction section to convey the essence of a research article?*

The present study tries to look at the application of the Swales' model in providing a solution for the problems faced by EFL and ESL writers in organizing an introduction section for a research article. In particular, it aims to find out how the Swales' model is applicable for conveying the proper message for the introduction section to a research article. Moreover, referring to the context of the author of this

study, the study of the development of a research article in English is still limited in undergraduate and graduate level studies. Moreover, it is found that hardly any studies have been conducted on the application of the Swales' model. Thus, the result of this study will be fruitful for students at undergraduate and graduate levels in writing a research article in English. It is hoped that this kind of study may contribute to teaching academic writing and help teachers and students in organizing academic articles in English.

## **2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE**

### **2.1 Introduction to the Swales or CARS Model**

The Swales model more famously known as the CARS model initiated a new concept of how the introduction for a research paper is best structured. The launching of the CARS model in 1990 by Swales has been said to be one of the most significant formulations for the structure of a research article introduction. Golebiowski and Liddicoat (2002) assert that CARS emerges as a primary idea in the schema of English academic writing written by Anglo-Americans. CARS is exclusively designed for introductions because this section is considered the most problematic section amongst others (Flowerdew, 1999; Swales, 1990) not only for EFL and ESL writers but also for native speakers.

Many analysts on academic text structure have dealt with this model. Some analysts followed and adapted the CARS model, yet others commented on the mismatch between the CARS format and the structure of introductions studied. Amongst those analysts who adapted and commented on the Swales model are Dudley-Evans (1986), Crookes (1986), Swales and Najjar (1987), Jacoby (1987), Peng (1987), Lewin and Fine (1996) (as cited in Golebiowski, 1999).

Various analysts have challenged others to research whether CARS is a fixed formulated structure for some English academic texts or an inclusive model that is relevant to apply for any discipline across languages and cultures (Golebiowski & Liddicoat, 2002). Research finding now show that rhetorical organization of texts is found to be different even though languages and cultures may be closely related to one another. This follows from research conducted by Ahmad (1997, as cited in Golebiowski, 1999) on Malay natural sciences articles and Safnil (2000) on Indonesian social sciences articles. Even though both languages derive from a similar root, the analysts found there are some steps and move in CARS which are not fully applicable for those articles. The 1990s Swales model is illustrated as follows:

**Move 1, establishing a territory:** Step 1: Claiming centrality (and/or), Step 2: Making topic generalization(s) (and/or), Step 3: Reviewing items of previous research

**Move 2, establishing a niche:** Step 1A: Counter-claiming (or), Step 1B: Indicating a gap (or), Step 1 C: Question-raising (or), Step 1D: Continuing a tradition

**Move 3, occupying the niche:** Step 1A: Outlining purposes (or), Step 1B: Announcing present research, Step 2: Announcing principal findings, Step 3: Indicating RA (Research Article) structure

However, since many gaps in some steps and moves of the 1990s CARS model have been found in some research papers, the flexibility of the CARS model had to be taken into account. Therefore in 2004, Swales proposed an updated version of CARS which is called CARS model 2004 (Broines, 2012) or the standard research article (Swales, 2004). This reconsidered model is said to be applicable for any discipline and any culture. Some steps in each move are fortified with some adjustment for different disciplines. Thus it makes this new model more adaptable to apply in the writing and analysis of research articles. The 2004 Swales' model is illustrated below:

**Move 1: Establishing a territory (citations required)\*\*\*, via**  
Topic generalizations of increasing specificity

**Move 2: Establishing a niche (citations possible)\*\*\*, via**  
Step 1A: Indicating a gap **or**  
Step 1B: Adding to what is known  
Step 2: Presenting positive justification (optional)

**Move 3: Presenting the present work, via**  
Step1: Announcing present research descriptively and/or purposively (obligatory)  
Step 2: Presenting research questions or hypotheses\*(optional)  
Step 3: Definitional clarifications (optional)\*  
Step 4: Summarizing methods (optional)\*  
Step 5: Announcing principal outcomes \*\*  
Step 6: Stating the value of the present research \*\*  
Step 7: Outlining the structure of the paper \*\*

\* Optional and less fixed in order

\*\* Probable in some academic disciplines

\*\*\* Possible cyclical patterning of moves particularly in longer Introductions

Overall, the updated version of CARS does not show dramatic differences from the previous model. In the previous model, move 1 shows three steps which include claiming centrality, making topic generalization and reviewing items of previous research respectively, whereas in the most recent version, there is only one step in Move 1. Move 2 moreover has significant changes between the two versions. The former model consists of four realization steps: counterclaiming, raising a question, indicating a gap, and continuing tradition. In the latest model however, Swales (2004) reduces it to two steps, with the first step split into two points derived from the former step 1.

Furthermore, Swales (1990) illustrates that Move 3 in the previous model shows three steps in which the first step was outlining purposes of the present research or announcing the present research. If one point is left out of this step in the research introduction, it is still considered acceptable. However, in the updated version, step 1 of move 3 is considered obligatory because outlining the purpose and the nature of the present research are combined in one step. This preference was made by considering the additional elements suggested by Anthony's (1999) study of computer science introductions. Moreover, other steps such as listing research questions or hypothesis, definitional clarifications, summarizing methods and stating the value of the present

research, which are missed in the 1990s model, make move 3 of the updated version consist of 7 steps (Swales, 2004). Steps 2 to step 4 are each optional and less fixed in their order of occurrence than the others, and steps 6 and 7 are present in some fields but unlikely in others.

## **2.2 Previous Research on the Application of the CARS Model**

The following are some previous researches that have applied the Swales' model in introductory sections for widely ranging studies from different genres, across different disciplines and different languages.

### *2.2.1 A Brief Summary of the Application of the CARS Model in Different Genres*

A study conducted by Samraj (2008) on introductions for master's theses across the disciplines of philosophy, biology and linguistics has proved that the Swales' model can be applied to various disciplines. The findings show that introductions for the three different disciplines follow the three moves suggested by the Swales' model. All introductions have the conventions of CARS in their texts; even though some steps are absent in the introductions for the philosophical theses. The biology and linguistics theses introductions for example, are equally similar in their rhetorical structure with differences mainly in step 2 of move 3 where a list of hypotheses are mostly present in the biology theses introductions. On the other hand, in philosophy theses introductions, the writers frequently do not justify their philosophical arguments in terms of previous research in the selected area (Samraj, 2008). Overall, the three theses introductions followed the three moves and several steps that are suggested by the Swales' model, only sometimes does a certain discipline not present a certain step. It shows that the structure of the Swales' model can be applied as the framework in organizing introductions for various disciplines.

Another study was conducted on introductions for PhD thesis by Carbonell-Olivares, Gil-Salom and Soler-Monreal (2011). This study similarly reveals that not all introductions conform fully to the 1990 Swales' model. However, the Move 1–Move 2–Move 3 arrangement is the structural pattern most generally followed. Differences occur due to differences in disciplines but are mainly caused by the differences in language patterns. As Yakhontova (2006, p. 154) states that “The discrepancies in writing styles and patterns of textual organization revealed in the texts contrasted are traditionally labelled as ‘cultural’ or ‘culture-specific’ differences”. In the Spanish introductions Move 2 is not always present. However, the presence of Move 1 and Move 3 are obligatory moves in PhD introductions. It shows that the need to establish a niche (Move 2) which would justify the work done is not demanded in the Spanish introductions (Carbonell-Olivares, Gil-Salom & Soler-Monreal, 2011). This finding agrees with Burgess's theory (2002), as cited in Carbonell-Olivares, Gil-Salom and Soler-Monreal (2011), that certain writers of RAIs (Research Article Introductions) tend to view the topic or problem discussed as entirely unfamiliar territory for their readers which explains why Spanish PhD candidates put so much effort into describing the territory and occupying a particular niche. Regarding the presence of Move 2 in the Spanish research papers, Carbonell-Olivares, Gil-Salom and Soler-Monreal (2011, p. 14) comment “showing knowledge of the field of research and defending a new and specific contribution to it seem to have higher priority than establishing a gap in

previous research, which explains the non-antagonistic point of view in the Spanish introductions". It indicates that the Spanish scientific community is less competitive compared to the English scientific community because in the structure of the English introductions it is usual to *establish a niche*.

The step analysis suggests that the structure of Spanish introductions is mainly motivated by the presentation of background information (S2 of M1) and the work carried out (S2 of M3), as well as the use of that information in a sequential and orderly style. Whereas, the English introductions do not only show great focus on the addition of background information and a separate step to the review of previous research (S2 and S4 of M1), but they also tend to stress the writer's own work, its originality and contribution to the field of study (S1, S2, S6, S7 of M3) (Carbonell-Olivares, Gil-Salom & Soler-Monreal, 2011).

### 2.2.2 A Brief Summary of the CARS Model Application across Disciplines

The application of the Swales' model across disciplines can be seen in the investigation conducted by Samraj (2002) on wildlife behaviour and conservation biology. The result shows that introductions for studies of wildlife behaviour and biology follow all parts of the moves contained in the new revised Swales' model (2004). Formerly this study had suggested that the old version of Swales' model (1990) be revised. Samraj's criticism that the presence of a literature review need not only appear in move 1 has instigated Swales' (2004) to suggest that review of literature need not only occur in the introduction but could occur throughout the article. Therefore, the 2004 version of Swales' model can successfully account for most of the limitations mentioned (Ozturk, 2007) with some new steps answering Samraj's criticisms.

### 2.2.3 A Brief Summary of the CARS Model Application across Languages

A study of move analysis across languages using the Swales' model for the introductions for research articles contrasted those written in Polish to others written in English (Golebiowski, 1999). The study concentrated on introductions to articles in the field of psychology. The findings showed that the introductions in Polish all failed in terms of the Swales' CARS model. This is because almost all rhetorical structure which could be classified in terms of Swales' moves was absent. It shows that Polish scholars employ a different writing style or genre to that of the English speaking writers. The Polish scholars writing in English tended to preserve their native style of writing even though they are faced with prescribed schemata for an acceptable scientific article. This affected the presentation of research articles they wrote which finally showed less rhetorical discipline (Golebiowski, 1999). As the CARS model was developed for the analysis of English scientific texts or introductions produced by native speaking English writers, it does not match in the case of introductions written by Polish writers when they are writing in English or Polish. Moreover, for teaching academic writing, this is a very useful case to teach students about English writing style compared to other languages.

On the other hand, a contrastive study between Thai and English studies in biochemistry conducted by Kanoksipalatham (2007) reveals that the structural organization displays similarities across both languages in terms of the moves identified and the general move sequence within the Swales' model. However, introductions in

Thai do not state the principal finding (M3, S5) which is different from that of the introductions in English. This case claimed that presenting the findings in introductions shows the characteristics of scientific articles in competitive communities predominantly those in American and English speaking countries (Kanoksipalatham, 2007). He also points out that this typical writing style is triggered by the competition among researchers to obtain research grants which are mainly granted for those that have worthwhile qualities.

Therefore, to show the importance of the study conducted, scientists are expected to highlight major findings of the study to demonstrate in brief their contribution to the field near the beginning of the research paper. It is important to note that the Swalesian style of introduction is worthwhile in writing a good presentation for a research paper. In addition, this model is fruitful when students are involved in English discourse in communities where competition is highly valued.

Furthermore, cultural influences in writing style cannot be avoided. This concern has been studied by Mauraneen (1993), Silva (1993), and Harris, Power and Wang (as cited in Mosher, Granroth & Hicks, 2000). A contrastive study between Chinese and English in educational psychology studies conducted by Loi and Evans (2010) scrutinized cultural differences in the structural organization of RAIs. This study adopted both the 1990 and the 2004 CARS models by Swales in order to study the differences between English and Chinese introductions. Loi and Evans (2010) found that both the English and the Chinese introductions had differences and similarities in rhetorical structure.

The study revealed similarities between the Chinese and the English introductions as both followed the three obligatory moves in the Swales models. Differences however, were noted in the use of language. Chinese writing tends to be more implicit than English writing. In principle there is high-contextual communication in Chinese. Even though move 1 exists in Chinese introductions, which is the centrality claim for the topic, it is lacking in explicitness (Loi & Evan, 2010). Based on Chinese traditions writing will be more highly valued when arguments are expressed implicitly in the text. Chinese writers also avoid making strong claims about the findings from previous researchers. It is strongly believed that criticizing the work of others in public is interpreted as embarrassment, Lu (2000) as cited in Loi and Evans (2010) states this as a face-saving strategy, which is common in Chinese culture. Nevertheless, apart from those differences, it is important to emphasize that the move analysis in Chinese followed the Swales models.

### **3. METHOD**

This study set sights on evaluating the Swales' model as a tool that is useful to develop ability in academic writing for research articles. The updated version of the Swales' model was used in this study. The study also examined a number of documents that facilitated the author in her investigation of this issue. Thus, the discussion about the use of the Swales' model in writing an 'introduction' for a research article was based on previous studies of the Swales' model, including comments and critics from other researchers; and the use of the Swales' model in applications. To examine the application of the Swales or CARS model in depth for writing research article introductions, three articles from professional writers were examined. To differentiate

these from introductions that do not necessarily follow the CARS model, the analysis of introductions from seven research article from the English Education Journal (EEJ) Vol.1, No. 1, 2010 published by the Graduate Program in English Language Education at Syiah Kuala University was also conducted.

## 4. RESULTS

### 4.1 Results from Analysis of the Introductions for Three Articles Written by Professional Writers

The three articles analyzed proved that even though not every step from the three moves suggested by the Swales model were performed in the introductions, nevertheless the three obligatory moves were significant in those introductions. The introductions of the professional writers examined in detail were as follows. *Genre pedagogy: Language, literacy and L2 writing instruction*: M1-M2,S1A-M2,S2-M3, S1-M3, S7, *I speak therefore I am: Self-perceptions of identity in immersion program language learners as an expression of intercultural competence*: M1-M2,S1B-M2, S2-M3, S1-M3,S6, and *Prominent messages in Education and Applied Linguistic abstracts: How do authors appeal to their prospective readers?*: M1-M2,S1A-M3, S1.

All the three introductions followed the CARS model schema which is one of the schemas that are acceptable in scientific papers. It showed that the introductions to research articles written by English professional writers were easy to segment into the three obligatory moves proposed by the CARS model.

### 4.2 Results from Analysis of the Introductions from Seven Articles in the EEJ Journal

It was concluded that only three of the seven articles in the EEJ followed the CARS model in terms of structure. Two articles, article 1, and 2 did not follow the moves and steps suggested by CARS, and one article, article 6, ends up with an unusual move that is not normally seen in the CARS structure. The result from the analysis is tabulated below:

**Table 1.** Move structure of the introductions from seven articles in the EEJ.

Article	Move sequence	M1	M2	M3	Total
1	M1-M3S1	1	-	1	2
2	M1	1	-	-	1
3	M1-M2S1A-M2S1B-M3S1-M3S2[M3S1]-M3S1	1	2	3[1]	5[1]
4	M1-M2S1A-M3S1-M2S2-M3S1-M3S2-M3S1	1	2	4	7
5	M1-M2S1A-M3S1-M3S2	1	1	2	4
6	M1-M3S1-M3S2-M3S1-M3S6	1	-	4	5
7	M1-M2S1A-M3S1-M3S3-M3S1-M1	2	1	3	6

[...] indicates a move embedded within another move

The result of the analysis depicted the following pattern: *Establishing a field by topic generalization—presenting the problems of related phenomenon—presenting the*



*current work by stating the research question/implications of the study. Establishing a field by stating the topic* is clearly seen in the introduction to each article in the EEJ.

## 5. DISCUSSION

The analysis of the introductions from the three articles written by professional writers has illustrated the simplicity of the Swales' CARS model schema application for an introduction. The three obligatory moves in the CARS model schema are presented and clearly stated in all three introductions and it obviously helps the readers understand the points discussed by the writer and also gives a clear picture about how the current study is presented. The findings of this analysis support the earlier investigation of the CARS model when applied to the rhetorical structure for introductions done by Golebiowski (1999) that showed that the CARS model is successfully portrayed in English introduction sections. Thus, it shows that the CARS model is a suitable schema to be applied for writing an introduction based on the English academic writing style.

On the other hand, the analysis of the introductions from seven articles in the EEJ has shown a dissimilar result. It has shown that only some introductions from the articles analyzed followed the CARS model. In the CARS model, M1 (*establishing a territory or field*) is supported by reviewing a large number of previous researches. Reviewing previous studies is needed in order to make a claim about the topic discussed. This part is also important for the reader's information in understanding the research focus. For that reason, Swales (2004) stated that citations are required in Move 1. The findings of this preliminary study, however, have shown that one (1) out of the 7 articles does not cite previous research and two (2) other articles refer to only one citation in the introduction. Reflecting on the CARS model, it seems that citations are not obligatory in establishing the background of the topic in those articles.

The second move in CARS is supported by the *indicating a gap step, adding to what is known and positive justification*. Move 2 of the introductions to articles in the EEJ was, however, mostly signalled by *presenting the problem from related phenomena*. The gap that the authors wanted to fill is focused on the problems that each author found from phenomena in their teaching experience. This step is considered as a pattern for a Research Article Introduction (RAI) in the EEJ, because no other gaps were found such as criticizing related methods, or revealing the limitation of the findings from previous studies. From the view point of the CARS model, presenting this kind of step in the research articles is accepted, but the critical point of the research article is weak. Another typical introduction was also found in the EEJ articles. There are three articles that do not have an M2. Therefore, the writers should have to establish that the previous research literature was not complete and required more inquiries by presenting an M2.

Move 3 in the CARS model is supported by many steps. One of them is the obligatory step *announcing the present research descriptively and or purposefully*. This step was extensively presented in the EEJ articles except for article 2. The writers tend to explicitly announce the research questions (M3-S2). Other steps such as M3-S3 (*definitional clarification*) and M3-S6 (*stating the value of the present research*) were also utilized in the RAI but infrequently appeared in all articles. However, the presence

of M3-S1 in the articles has shown that the authors are aware of the importance of stating the aim of their study.

It can be summarized that research articles in the EEJ did not fully follow the schema suggested in the CARS model proposed by Swales. The presence of M1 seemingly showed the need of the writers/researchers to state the topic at the beginning part of the introduction, whilst M2 is obviously seen in the need of the writers/researchers to state that the problem of the study is to fill the gap or the weakness in previous research. Therefore, it is suggested that to establish a more critical and competitive research community, the writers/researchers could elaborate more in order to establish the niche of the current study through indicating a gap in previous research. The presence of M3 in the introductions is significantly observed through M3-S1 and some optional steps such as M3-S2, M3-S3 and M3-S6. However, it is not fully covered in all introductions. Swales suggested that the presence of other optional steps could increase the value and impression of the articles and assure the readers that the article presented is significant.

## 6. CONCLUSION

The study sought to answer the following research question: *How does the Swales' model apply for writing the introduction section to convey the essence of a research article?*

In order to answer the research question, the procedural application of Swales' model in writing an introduction section was presented. First of all, the author took some samples of introductions written by researchers who applied the Swales' model, and then segmented those introductions into the three obligatory moves of the Swales' model. The procedure of how Swales' model applied for writing a research article introduction is briefly summarized in the following description.

The first move—*establishing territory*—is done at the beginning of an introduction; this move shows a big picture of the general topic of a research article. The writer in this move tries to broadly draw where the subject of the article falls. In this part, the writer also reviews previous researches in order to support the topic. According to Swales, reviewing previous research is required in Move 1 (M1) in order to add to the credibility of the study conducted. Commonly, the topic generalization and the review of previous research are separated in different paragraphs but in longer introductions the review of previous research can extend across several paragraphs.

The next move is move two (M2) called *establishing a niche*. In this move, the writer then points out to the reader the particular area of the broader subject that his research article will deal with. In this move, the writer can include *indicating a gap* or *adding to what is known* steps. In addition, the writer can also state positive justification as an optional step in the study conducted. In an *indicating a gap step*, some limitations from previous studies related to the area of the current study are presented. Otherwise, the significance of the current study will not be clearly pointed out. Whilst an *adding to what is known* step is presented when the writers do not criticize the previous studies but add some other new points to the topic. A *presenting positive justification* step sets out positive points justifying the study which include benefits and usefulness to readers or participants of the study conducted.

After presenting the second move, the next significant move that must be done by the writer is *occupying the niche/presenting the present work* or Move three (M3). In this move, the writer then delineates exactly what this article will accomplish in relation to move 2, and gives the reader a sense of how the article will proceed. This move contains one obligatory step—*announcing present research descriptively and /or purposefully*, three optional steps—*presenting research questions or hypothesis, definitional clarifications, and summarizing methods*, and three other steps that are probable in some fields—*announcing principal outcomes, stating the value of the present research and outlining the structure of the paper*. Those steps certainly give opportunities for the writers of research papers to expand the interestingness of their work towards the end of their introduction. Moreover, the availability of optional steps depends on some factors, such as the nature of the research, the aspirations of researchers and the conventions of the research field. Those steps can create a better impression and reassure readers that the paper is worth pursuing further.

On the other hand, this preliminary study was conducted to observe whether the introductions for the articles studied follow some obligatory schema for introductions in research articles. The findings however, showed that the articles have their own particular pattern: *Establishing a field by topic generalization—presenting the problems of related phenomenon—presenting the current work by stating the research question/implication of the study*. It was found that the articles did not follow all the steps in the CARS model, particularly the *indicating a gap* step by reviewing the limitations of previous research, which CARS perceives as an obligatory step. Nevertheless, it is not presented in those introductions. *Indicating a gap* by reviewing the limitation from the previous research is considered an important step because this step shows the significance of the current study. Thus it makes the study worthwhile to be pursued further. Additionally, from the analysis, the introductions from some of the articles in the EEJ have different orders of moves to those presented in the CARS model. Two articles do not depict the moves and steps recommended by CARS, and one article, finished with an unusual move that is not in the CARS model.

Using the results from previous research into the study topic has greatly helped the author to present evidence of the usefulness of the CARS model in writing an introduction for a research article. This preliminary study has also become one of the efforts to make the application of the CARS model in research studies become more comprehensible. However, the data used in this study has limitations. The number of previous researches used for the data of this study is still limited and mostly not clearly related to the methods used in this study. Similarly, the number of articles analyzed in this preliminary study is far from sufficient. Only one journal that consists of seven articles was taken as the source of data. In addition, regarding the results of the analysis, the author realizes that it is possible that different individuals may assign different move boundaries, thus the author believes the results of this study analysis could possibly be judgmental because the author analyzed it by herself. Consequently, integrating more authors in analyzing the data could reduce the limitation and help to boost the strength of analysis. This study, however, has teaching implications: viz. the CARS model or schema may assist novice and early career writers in structuring the introduction section of a research paper. For teachers, this model can be used as one of the guidelines used in teaching academic writing.

## REFERENCES

- Anthony, L. (1999). Writing research article introductions in software engineering: How accurate is a standard model? *IEEE Transactions on Professional Communication*, 42(1), 38-46.
- Broines, R. R. Y. (2012). Move analysis of philosophy research article introductions published in the University of Santo Tomas. *Philippine ESL Journal*, 9, 56-75.
- Carbonell-Olivares, M., Gil-Salom, L., & Soler-Monreal, C. (2011). A contrastive study of the rhetorical organisation of English and Spanish PhD thesis introductions. *English for Specific Purposes*, 30(1), 4-17.
- Flowerdew, J. (1999). Problem in writing for scholarly publication in English: The case of Hong Kong. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 8(3), 243-264.
- Golebiowski, Z., & Liddicoat A. J. (2002). The interaction of discipline and culture in academic writing. *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics*, 25(2), 59-71.
- Jalilifar, A. (2010). Research article introduction: sub-disciplinary variations in applied linguistics *The Journal of Teaching Language Skills*, 2(2), 29-55.
- Kanoksipalatham, B. (2007). Writing scientific research articles in Thai and English: similarities and differences. *Silpakorn University International Journal*, 7, 121-203.
- Loi, C. K., & Evans, M. S. (2010). Cultural differences in the organization of research article introductions from the field of educational psychology: English and Chinese. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 42(10), 2814-2825.
- Mauranen, A. (1993). Cultural differences in academic discourse-problems of a linguistic and cultural minority. In L. Löfman, L. Jurki-Suonio, S. Pellinen, & J. Lehtonen (Eds.), *The competent intercultural communicator* (pp. 157-174). Tampere: AFinLA.
- Mosher, D., Granroth, D., & Hicks, T. (2000). Creating a common ground with ESL writers. *The Writing Lab Newsletter*, 24(7), 1-7.
- Ozturk, I. (2007). The textual organisation of research article introductions in applied linguistics: Variability within a single discipline. *English for Specific Purposes*, 26(1), 25-38.
- Peacock, M. (2002). Communicative moves in the discussion section of research articles. *System*, 30(4), 479-497.
- Ruiying, Y., & Allison, D. (2003) Research articles in applied linguistics: Moving from results to conclusions. *English for Specific Purposes*, 22(4), 365-385.
- Safnil. (2007). The dialogue technique of teaching writing research article introduction (RAI) in English. *Forum Pendidikan*, 26(2), 127-133.
- Safnil. (2000). *Rhetorical structure analysis of the Indonesian research articles*. (Doctoral), The Australian National University, Canberra.
- Samraj, B. (2008). A discourse analysis of master's theses across disciplines with a focus on introductions. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 7(1), 55- 67.
- Samraj, B. (2005). An explanation of genre set: Research article abstracts and introductions in two disciplines. *English for Specific Purposes*, 24(2), 141-156.
- Samraj, B. (2002). Introductions in research articles: Variations across disciplines. *English for Specific Purposes*, 21(1), 1-17.
- Silva, T. (1993). Toward an understanding of the distinct nature of L2 writing: The ESL research and its implications. *TESOL Quarterly*, 27(4), 657-667.

- Swales, J. M. (1990). *Genre analysis: English in academic and research settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Swales, J. M. (2004) *Research genres: Explorations and applications*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Yakhontova, T. (2006). Cultural and disciplinary variation in academic discourse: The issue of influencing factors. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 5(2), 153–167.

[Received 04 January 2013; revised 03 February 2014; accepted 03 March 2014]

## THE AUTHORS

**Burhanuddin Yasin** holds a PhD in Education Management and is a senior lecturer at the Study Program of English Language Education, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, University of Syiah Kuala, Banda Aceh, Indonesia. He is currently the head of the Study Program of English Language Education at the same university.

**Hijjatul Qamariah** is one of the teaching staff at Iskandarmuda University and Language Development Centre of Islamic State University (UIN) Ar-Raniry, Banda Aceh, Indonesia. She completed her undergraduate degree in English Education from UIN Ar-Raniry. During her study at UIN Ar-Raniry, she was offered a scholarship by AMINEF, IELSP, studying English and American Culture at University of Arkansas in 2008. In 2012, she completed her dual Master degree program of Teaching English to Speakers of other Languages from Deakin University and Master of Education (M. Pd) from Syiah Kuala University in 2014. Her research interests include literature and discourse analysis.